

## REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application. No amendments have been previously filed. Claims 1, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e). Claims 2-20, 22, and 24-39 are rejected under USC §103(a). Applicant is amending claims 1, 2, 13, 17, 21, 23, 24, 30, 36, and 37 in this response.

### Claims Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 21, and 23 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Tarrant (US 2002/0128939). Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify the feature of “a confirming component for confirming, based on the response, that the new relationship may be established, **the response being indicative of a trust level about the sought entity by the intermediate entity for the existing relationship**” as disclosed in the specification as originally filed. The specification, for example, states (Paragraph 7. Emphasis added.):

In one embodiment, the present invention provides a system that permits a seeking entity to establish a new business relationship with a sought entity. An inquiry receiving component is capable of receiving an inquiry from the seeking entity. A response receiving component is capable of receiving **a response, which indicates that there is an existing relationship between the sought entity and an intermediate entity**. And, a confirming component is capable of confirming, based on the response, that the new relationship may be established between the seeking and sought entities. (Entity or entities can include individuals, partners, corporations, companies, partnerships, and/or any other type of business structures.)

However, Tarrant teaches (Abstract. Emphasis added.):

The invention comprises a method and system for sharing information over a computer network, the method comprising the steps of: **receiving data regarding a particular investment over a computer network from a first user computer**; storing the data from the first user in a relational database and identifying the data as coming from the first user, **wherein the first user is identified as a member of a hierarchy of sources organized by level of trustworthiness**; receiving a request over the computer network from a second user for data from the relational database regarding the particular investment; and, in response to the request from the second user, transmitting the data from the relational database to a second user computer, wherein, absent a request from the second user for data from a specific source or level of trustworthiness, the data transmitted comprise data from users of the highest level of trustworthiness available.

Tarrant teaches about a level of trustworthiness of a source of information, where the information is about a particular investment, and not about a feature of “a confirming component

for confirming, based on the response, that the new relationship may be established, the response being indicative of a trust level about the sought entity by the intermediate entity for the existing relationship". Thus, Applicant submits that Tarrant does not anticipate claim 1 as amended. Similarly, Applicant has amended claim 21 to have the feature of "establishing the new business relationship with the sought entity based on the response, the response being indicative of a trust level about the sought entity by the intermediate entity." Also, Applicant has amended claim 23 to have the feature "receiving a confirmation of a relationship between the at least one trusted company, the confirmation being indicative of a trust level of the unknown company by one of the at least one trusted company." For similar reasons, as discusses above, Applicant submits that Tarrant does not anticipate claims 21 and 23 and thus requests for reconsideration of claims 1, 21, and 23.

### **Claims Rejections – 35 USC §103**

Claims 2-12, 22, 24, 29-30, and 35-36 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarrant in view of Krysiak et al. (US 2002/0078003). Applicant has amended claim 2 to include the feature of "at least one transactional trust list containing at least one parameter relative to an exchange between at least two of the entities through at least one degree of separation between the entities, the at least one parameter comprising a level of trust of a sought entity by an intermediate entity" as disclosed in the specification as originally filed. The specification, for example, states (Paragraph 45):

The activity-trust parameters [which may be included in one or more transactional trust lists] can be used to quantify the level or nature of the business relationship. By categorizing the nature of the business relationship, an entity can better judge the level of trust in the relationship and/or put other trust measures in context. For example, in a close business relationship a manufacturer and distributors may share information regarding planning and forecasting for inventory movements, but may not share information pertaining to product development. Activity trust parameters include, but are not limited to the following: type of transaction a particular entity can handle, such as purchasing, outsourcing, sub-contracting, etc.; activity trust levels; and performance or activity of a partner in the past, such as size of order, monetary limits put in place, numbers of mishandled orders, etc.

As previously discussed, Tarrant teaches only about a level of trustworthiness of a source of information, where the information is about a particular investment. Moreover, as stated in the Office Action, Krysiak does "teach a method and system for identifying information sources based on one or more trust networks associated with one or more knowledge domains, wherein

the multiple path connections is provided for identifying the most trusted path connection.” Applicant submits that the combination of Tarrant and Krysiak does not teach or even suggest the feature of “at least one transactional trust list containing at least one parameter relative to an exchange between at least two of the entities through at least one degree of separation between the entities, **the at least one parameter comprising a level of trust about a sought entity by an intermediate entity.**” (Emphasis added.) Claims 3-12 depend from claim 2. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 2-12 are patentable over Tennant in view of Krysiak, for at least the reasons above, and requests for reconsideration.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21. Applicant submits that the combination of Tennant and Krysiak does not teach or even suggest the feature of “establishing the new business relationship with the sought entity based on the response, the response being indicative of a trust level about the sought entity by the intermediate entity” as included in claim 21. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 22 is patentable and requests for reconsideration.

Applicant has amended claim 24 to include the feature of “establishing a relationship between the first and second entities when the first entity is known by at least one respective entity of the trusted entities, the relationship being **based on information from one of the trusted entities, the information being indicative of a trust level about the first entity**” as supported by the specification as discussed above. (Emphasis added.) Applicant submits that neither Tennant nor Krysiak nor the combination teaches this feature, as discussed above. Tennant teaches, for example, about a level of trustworthiness of a source of information and not about a particular investment that is sought. Similarly, Applicant has amended claim 30 to include the limitation of “establishing a relationship between the first and second entities when the first entity is known by at least one respective entity of the trusted entities, the relationship being based on information from one of the least one respective entity, the information being indicative of a level of trust about the first entity”, and thus claim 30 is patentable for at least the above reasons. Claim 29 depends from claim 24. Thus, Applicant requests for reconsideration of claim 24, 29, and 30.

The Office Action states that Tarrant “teaches all of the limitations” of claim 35 “except for specifying the degree of separations between the entities.” Applicant respectively disagrees. Claim 35 includes the features of:

(h) forwarding, by the third company, based on a respective list of peers thereof and a **trust agreement** between the first company and the third company, a “Do You Know” query to further Companies on behalf of the first company, verifying **rights management models** between all peers

(i) verifying by the further Companies the **rights management model** and determining if any of the further Companies know the second company

(l) notifying, by the third company, the first company that the third company knows the second company through the predetermined number of degrees of separation, and passing **transitive trust rights** to the first company

(m) establishing, by the first company, contact with the respective company through **the trust passed** by the third company

Applicant submits that neither Tarrant nor the combination of Tennant and Krysiak teaches or even suggests the above features for at least the above reasons. Thus, Applicant requests for reconsideration of claim 35.

Applicant has amended claim 36 to include the feature of “establishing a relationship between the first and second entities when the first entity is known by at least one respective entity of the trusted entities, the relationship being based on information from one of the at least one respective entity, the information being indicative of a level of trust about the first entity.” As previously discussed, neither Tarrant nor Krysiak nor the combination teaches or even suggests this feature. Thus, Applicant requests for reconsideration of claim 36.

Claims 13-20, 25-28, 31-34, and 37-39 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarrant in view of Krysiak and Smith (US 2002/0152086). Applicant has amended claim 13 to include the feature of “a capability domain and activity trust level data base for each of the at least two entities, the data base having a plurality of levels of trust and a plurality of entity roles, each level of trust being provided about a sought entity by an intermediate entity for a seeking entity” as disclosed in the specification as originally filed. As previously discussed, Tarrant does teach about a level of trustworthiness of a source of information and not about a particular investment that is sought. As stated in the Office Action, Krysiak does “teach a method and system for identifying information sources based on one or more trust networks associated with one or more knowledge domains, wherein the multiple path connections is provided for identifying the most trusted path connection.” Moreover, as stated in the Office Action, Smith does “teach a method and system for controlling a lifestyle of an electronic contract for a business relationship, wherein roles are associated with business

relationship elements.” However, Applicant submits that the combination of Tarrant, Krysiak, and Smith does not teach or even suggest the feature of “a capability domain and activity trust level data base for each of the at least two entities, **the data base having a plurality of levels of trust and a plurality of entity roles, each level of trust being provided about a sought entity by an intermediate entity for a seeking entity.**” (Emphasis added.) Similarly, Applicant has amended claim 17 to include the feature of “a capability domain and activity trust level data base for each of the at least two entities, the database having a plurality of levels of trust and a plurality of entity roles, each level of trust being provided about a sought entity by an intermediate entity for a seeking entity.” Claims 13-16 and 18-20 depend from claims 13 and 17. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 13-20 are patentable over Tarrant in view of Krysiak and Smith and requests for reconsideration.

Claims 25-29 depend from claim 24. As discussed above, Applicant submits that the combination of Tarrant and Krysiak does not teach all the features of claim 24. Moreover, Smith does not teach or even suggest the feature of “establishing a relationship between the first and second entities when the first entity is known by at least one respective entity of the trusted entities, the relationship being based on information from one of the trusted entities, the information being indicative of a trust level about the first entity.” Thus, Applicant requests for reconsideration of claims 25-29.

Claims 31-34 depend from claim 30. For similar reasons as discussed above, Applicant submits that the combination of Tarrant, Krysiak, and Smith does not teach or even suggest all the features of claim 30. Thus, Applicant requests for reconsideration of claims 31-34.

Applicant has amended claim 37 to include the feature of “an activity trust domain having a plurality of levels of trust, each level of trust being provided about a sought entity by an intermediate entity for a seeking entity” as supported by the specification as discussed above. Moreover, as discussed above, Applicant submits that the combination of Tarrant, Krysiak, and Smith does not teach or even suggest this feature. Moreover, claims 38-39 depend from this claim. Thus, Applicant requests for reconsideration of claims 37-39.

### CONCLUSIONS

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Date: September 30, 2003

Respectfully submitted,  
By: Kenneth F. Smolik  
Kenneth F. Smolik  
Registration No. 44,344  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 3000  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Direct Line: 312-463-5419  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001